DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 909 PS 010 648

AUTHOR	Berkeley, Muriel V., Ed.; Dennis, Deborah Ellis, Ed.
TITLE	Youth Development and Families.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Social Research Group.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 78
CONTRACT	HEW-105-78-1300
NOTE	57p.; Proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence (Washington, D.C., September 18-19, 1978)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Family (Sociological Unit); *Public Policy; Research Methodology; Research Needs; Theories; *Youth; *Youth Employment; *Youth Problems; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This report includes the keynote address and summaries of discussions from three workgroups and the plenary session of a conference on youth development and families. The key address, "Reflections on Youth and Policies for Youth" by Martin Trow, presented a typology which categorized youth in terms of adequacy of financial resources and adequacy of socialization. The typology was used to illustrate how the focus of programs for youth may vary depending on the type of youth served. The address also included observations on labor markets for youth and relationships between local politics and federal programs. A summary of the discussion following the address is included in the report. The three workgroup dicussions concerned youth development and families, youth development within the context of the larger society, and theory of youth development. Topics discussed in the first workgroup included definition of the family, the diversity of research orientations on youth development and families, methodological issues in research, and a variety of substantive issues. Topics of particular interest in the second workgroup were the quality of youth service programs, local involvement, public schools, alternative conceptualizations of youth development, labeling of antisocial youth, and means of stimulating and funding innovative research. Of concern in the third workgroup were conceptual issues, stages, the role of culture, role diffusion, and socialization. The plenary session focused on research priorities. Included in the report is an outline of the conference agenda and a list of the participants. (SS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED172909

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILIES

September 18-19, 1978

Proceedings of a Conference Sponsored by
the Interagency Panel for Research and
Development on Adolescence

Edited by
Muriel V. Berkeley
Deborah Ellis Dennis

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

PS010648

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract HEW-105-78-1300 with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

October 1978

CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

- A new, interdisciplinary method of approaching policies for youth
- A typology of youth useful for planning and evaluating youth policies
- The transition from the secondary to the primary labor market
- The subterranean economy and its influence on public policy
- The involvement of Federal youth programs in local politics
- The diversity of "the American Family"
- Coping strategies of adolescents and of families
- Development of adolescents and of parents and of families
- Factors contributing to the effectiveness of youth workers and youth service programs
- Positive youth development
- Problems with definitions of "adolescence" and "youth"
- Priorities with respect to research methodology:
  - conceptualization
  - theory building
  - creative, dynamic methodology
  - interdisciplinary work
  - experimental research grounded in theory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION..... 1

REFLECTIONS ON YOUTH AND POLICIES FOR YOUTH
The Keynote Address by Dr. Martin Trow..... 1

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FOLLOWING DR. TROW'S ADDRESS..... 21

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILIES
Summary of the Discussion in Workgroup I..... 25

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE LARGER SOCIETY
Summary of the Discussion in Workgroup II..... 30

THEORY OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
Summary of the Discussion in Workgroup III..... 34

SUMMARY OF PLENARY SESSION DISCUSSION..... 37

APPENDIX A: THE CONFERENCE AGENDA..... 39

APPENDIX B: THE CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS..... 43

INTRODUCTION

A Conference on Youth Development and Families was held in September 1978, sponsored by the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence so that researchers in the Federal government could meet with researchers from outside the Federal government, and pool ideas and concerns about research on youth development and families. For over a year the Adolescence Panel has been considering approaches to the study of youth development. As Bill Daniels, Chairperson of the Panel, noted in his welcoming remarks, interest in youth development has been increasing rapidly in recent years. Mr. Daniels also pointed out that the interagency and interdisciplinary nature of the Panel makes it a unique forum for discussion about youth.

The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence was created in 1972 and charged with promoting cooperation and exchange of information between Federal agencies who support work on youth and adolescents. The Adolescence Panel, whose age coverage extends from 10 years through adolescence and into the early 20's, carries out its tasks in close cooperation with the Interagency Panel for Early Childhood Research and Development after which it was modeled. The two Panels share information about their agencies' research programs and plans, and diverse problems and issues of interagency concern. Furthermore, in cases where their interests coincide, the Panels participate jointly in special meetings and activities.

Edith Grotberg, Chairperson of the Executive Committee of the Interagency Panels, explained in her opening remarks that the Interagency Panels provide intellectual leadership within the government and across agencies. They do so in part by sponsoring conferences such as this where researchers sharing an interest in a field such as youth development and families can come together and pool their thoughts. Dr. Grotberg also mentioned the role that the Interagency Panels has taken over the past year in investigating the trend in Federal funding for research on children and youth away from basic and applied research and into demonstrations. This trend indicates an increased use of RD&E funds for political purposes, since demonstration projects are supported by political constituencies. Dr. Grotberg

expressed the Panels' concern that this trend is undermining our country's knowledge base about the development of children, youth and their families.

The Conference on Youth Development and Families was attended by sixteen resource persons representing a variety of universities, programs, agencies and disciplines, and by over seventy participants also representing a variety of government agencies, universities, programs and disciplines (see Appendix B). An inspiring and thought-provoking keynote address was given by Dr. Martin Trow of the Graduate School of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley. These proceedings include Dr. Trow's address and summaries of the conference discussions. The Conference Agenda is presented in Appendix A and a List of Conference Participants in Appendix B.

REFLECTIONS ON YOUTH AND POLICIES FOR YOUTH

The Keynote Address by Dr. Martin Trow*

I am very glad to be here, although it seems to me implausible on the face of it that anybody from the provinces might have anything to tell the people in Washington about Federal programs for youth. Maybe I am here in the service of my own education; that is the only way I can justify it. I think what brings us together is a common interest in how young people become adults. I think we know that some of them have difficulty in making the transition, and we are concerned in our several ways with what, if anything, governments can do to help some young people who have difficulties becoming mature, responsible adults. People who can love and who can work. The question might be: What kinds of knowledge and insight might help anybody, inside or outside government, to design and implement programs that might help youth become responsible adults?

There are a number of relevant traditions. One is the body of work concerned with the processes of growing up, the psychosexual and the psychosocial developments associated with becoming adult. Erik Erikson is a great name in that tradition. There is the study of youth employment and of the labor markets that youth enter more or less successfully. That's a study of the kinds of jobs that young people get and how they get them. There is somewhat differently a study of the paths through which people become adult, the ways they get the education and training that they do and the links between that and their first job. This focuses on individual projectories rather than on the job market. That tradition may also include in a peripheral way some attention to the role of public programs for youth. Then there is the study of public programs themselves: how they are initiated and funded, organized and administered; how they actually work in Washington, in the regional offices, out in the field; whether among other things they have any effects, intended or otherwise, and on whom and through what mechanism. Let me say with the strongest possible emphasis that the study of any of these problem areas would profit from some attention to all. The study of the social psychology of adolescence is incomplete without attention to educational and economic institutions, as well as the planning in and through which youth are prepared for and initiated into adult roles. Similarly, the study of

---

*Edited and abbreviated slightly.

the labor markets for youth and the trajectories of youth into the secondary and primary markets require that we understand how different kinds of young people are equipped to use their experience in their first jobs throughout their careers. Clearly, concern for the nature and role of public programs for youth must depend to some extent on our understanding of the social psychology of maturation and of other institutions besides government programs. All of this may seem a sort of truism, but given the organization of academic life and its high degree of specialization in the search of scholarship, there is the academic division of labor. People who work in different traditions do not very often communicate with one another. They do not address the same problems; they do not read the same books; they do not go to the same meetings on the whole (this may well be an exception); they do not usually speak the same language. For example, the first tradition I spoke of--the study of maturational processes of youth--is really dominated by the psychologists, social psychologists and sociologists; labor market analysis is, of course, part of the economist's domain, with some help from statisticians and demographers; the studies of youthful careers have been done for the most part by counseling and testing psychologists and career specialists. The studies of design, organization, and administration of government programs and agencies tends to be a monopoly of political scientists, and students of organizational theory and public administration. Almost all scientific and scholarly progress, I believe, is a part of specialization, of that academic division of labor although it is very easy to abuse it. But large social problems of the kind that bring us together today do not present themselves in the convenient categories of the academic disciplines. Insofar as we want to illuminate those problems in ways that are relevant to public policy, then we have to try to transcend the disciplines, so far as we can, so as to make use of all of them. I should say that for me that is not the counsel of perfection but of necessity. In my own work recently on youth and youth problems and policies, I have been trying to do that. To illustrate in these few minutes this morning, I would like very quickly to touch on several quite different aspects of youth and its problems in contemporary America.

I want to suggest, to begin with, a very simple typology of youth that may be of some use in thinking about policies and youth. Then I want to discuss very briefly some problems of youth employment and the labor markets of youth. Then

I will not have time to do more than make a passing reference to one or two characteristics of the federally supported youth programs as they appear in the field. I will not have time, but I would like to indicate that another area of relevant work would be a discussion of some actual problems and dilemmas in the organization and administration of youth policies at the Federal level. If my remarks have any central point, it is the desirability, perhaps the necessity of carrying on the study of youth and public policies for youth on different intellectual fronts simultaneously, to attack them from different perspectives at the same time. Perhaps by way of footnote, we may find that we are actually committed to a genuine disciplinary approach to these problems. Then we may find that our work at any given point is simpler and less sophisticated than is the work or would be the work of the specialist on the same mission. I find it to be both an interesting and a hopeful matter that useful kinds of information need not be carried to the degree of sophistication and refinement that specialists think they ought to be.

Let me then start by considering the usefulness of a very simple perspective on youth as a concept. I do not think there is any single youth problem that will be or would be responsive to public policy. I would suggest that the concept of youth may be of only limited value to us. To put it another way, when we are thinking about public policies, we are more concerned with what characteristics are shared by youth than by the differences among them, especially those differences that are associated with variations in the behavior of youth that give rise to social problems and most especially by those differences which are or might be responsive to purposeful intervention. Social scientists and historians may find, and do indeed find, a broad concept of youth useful in exploiting changes in economic, family, education, and other aspects of social life in the past, say, 200 years which have affected the life and experience of young people in modern industrial society. Others may analyze youth as a stage in the life cycle and discuss special problems, say, of psychosexual development that are experienced by modern youth between the onset of puberty and the assumption of full adult roles in modern society. But when you turn to the social problems that have been created or exacerbated by those social historical developments, and the possible interventions by public agencies to deal with those problems for their effects, then the concept of youth is no longer very useful to us. The problems take very different forms in different parts of our society and also quite different forms in different societies, even those that look like ours. Our

responses to those problems have to be adapted to the specific forms the problems take and not to the broad generic difficulties characterizing the whole of the youth population. This is perhaps another way of saying that for effective policy and perhaps for more individual analysis as well, we must disaggregate.

What categories of youth might be useful to designs of policies for youth? Certainly there are important relevant differences between age categories within this broad category of youth, others by the level of education youth complete. Over and above both those, I think there are two further characteristics of youth that have a bearing on the kinds of youth policies and programs the government might design. One of these, simply enough, is the financial resources available to a young person. That means in most cases, the family's resources. The issue here is whether those resources are adequate to allow a young person to realize his or her potential, that is, to find a place in the world that is roughly commensurate with his or her own talents, energies, and aspirations. Turn it the other way around, the question might be put, for what section or proportion of youth would additional public aid, either through cash transfers, delivery of services, or provision of subsidies make an appreciable difference to their fulfillment of their own potential and to the society at large? For some young people lack of funds is not a limiting condition on their development. For others, lack of resources at this period of their lives is clearly a sharp limitation on what they can do and what they can achieve later on. Without begging any questions about the responsibilities of the state in addressing those inequalities or where and how the line should be drawn, I think it is useful to distinguish between those youth for whom family resources are adequate and those for whom such resources are inadequate for their development during these years.

The second characteristic of youth relevant to policies for them is whether their socialization or what might be called their moral education up to the age of 16 or 17 has been adequate to enable them to move forward and then accept and fulfill socially acceptable adult roles. While there is less consensus than formerly on what acceptable roles and role performance are in family, political, and religious institutions, there is still a broad consensus around the notion that a person should be able to gain and hold a job, when jobs are available, and not be supported either on public welfare or through criminal activities. But even the most undemanding jobs require some motivation and the ability to delay gratification and to plan ahead, to get to work on time more or less regularly. Most jobs in modern society demand also certain minimum levels of competence in reading,

writing and arithmetic; the capacity to accept a certain measure of responsibility; and the ability to enter into necessary personal relationships. In considering policies for youth, it is useful to distinguish then between those whose early education and socialization have given them the motivation, skills, and personal qualities that will enable them to get and hold jobs from those who are markedly deficient in any or all of those respects.

Now if we consider just those two dimensions together, we find that they generate a very simple typology of youth which may have some relevance to public policies and quotas. If for simplicy we simply dichotomize the two factors, they produce four categories, each with its own rather different characteristics. We have one category for whom family resources and early socialization have been adequate. We call those people "the advantaged." We have another category for whom family resources have been adequate, but the socialization has gone awry in certain crucial ways, and we might refer to those people as "the alienated." We have another group whose family financial resources are not adequate but whose emotional and moral resources are adequate. Those people we can call "disadvantaged," and there are those unfortunate people for whom both financial and emotional and cognitive resources are inadequate, and they are genuinely deprived.

The advantaged are young men and women upon whom fortune has smiled. They have the personal and financial resources to move toward adult goals in society that are roughly commensurate with their talents and ambitions. We may ask, what are the problems of the advantaged youth that might fall to government to support? At first glance it might appear that they do not have any, but these are young people on whom society most heavily depends. The quality of the institutions, training, and experience available to that segment is crucial to the quality of their development and ultimately to the society in which they will be largely sustained. Society ought to be concerned about their skills, about the knowledge that they will bring to their adult roles and jobs. It should be concerned also about the fit between skills and expectations engendered by their formal schooling and other experiences, and the actual opportunities to use those skills to fulfill those expectations in their adult careers. No society can neglect the institutions and programs designed for advantaged youth on the grounds that they can look after themselves, and no society does.

We might ask what kinds of programs are available to advantaged youth. The answer is that chief among the ones that are primarily used by those people, which aim to serve them by increasing their skills and experience, are the systems and insitutions of higher education, the colleges and universities. Most

modern societies support broad systems of post-secondary education which largely serve the advantaged young people whose parents can help them prepare for further education and then fully or partially support their post-secondary studies. Even where higher education is nominally free, these are people who can forego the earnings of their children who are on full- or part-time studies. Systems of post-secondary education in this country now increasingly also try to serve numbers of disadvantaged youth with growing programs of student aids, grants, and loans, designed to reduce the handicap of low financial income for those able to go on to some form of post-secondary education. There are also programs designed primarily to tap the energies and abilities of those advantaged youth in the service of others and of the society at large. The Peace Corps was an example of that kind of program, as are many service programs for youth organized through colleges, churches, and youth organizations. Those programs, incidentally, also contribute to the education and personal development of their participants. There are programs designed for the whole population of youth, or more directly for other segments than the advantaged, but in which the advantaged youth also take part. The old CCC was an example of that kind; VISTA has become so as it has recruited more low-income minorities. A program for universal human services might be the archetype for this kind of program.

What are some of the considerations that policy makers had in mind with regard to the participation of advantaged youth in public programs and institutions? First, advantaged youth have legitimate needs of their own, for example, further education, some of which the state will want to meet. What are some of their needs apart from formal post-secondary education? First, they may have special contributions to make to programs of service to others. Insofar as they have certain resources and capacities, we can see a need to fulfill them. Second, advantaged youth tend to know about and take advantage of almost any extension or improvement in social or educational services sooner and more fully than do youth in the other three categories. We see this, for example, in their disproportionate enrollment in the community colleges. They always seem to be seizing opportunities that are created for disadvantaged youth. The participation of the advantaged in programs designed primarily for youth in the other categories may be desirable not so much on the grounds of their needs, but rather because their participation may be useful, may even be necessary to avoid the stigmatizing of those programs. I think we have to think about the importance of a proportion of youth who are not in need in shaping the character and public image of a program that is primarily designed

for the disadvantaged. Their participation may also help to gain political support for those programs. We know very well the attractiveness of broad spectrum programs to politicians, and they may indeed help raise the quality of programs. On the other hand, there is an awkward dilemma, since money spent on advantaged youth may not be available for youth in other categories whose needs are greater. The question of the eligibility of funds for use by the advantaged is of great concern.

When we speak of alienated youth, we are talking about young people who have not been deprived economically, but who have had difficulty in handling transition to adulthood because of other problems having to do with some difficulties in their earlier socialization, their education, the ways in which they have been neglected by the larger society through their families. I call them alienated because many of them are psychologically and emotionally outside and hostile to the society in which they live, and their behavior is governed to a considerable degree by their being apart from, hostile to, the dominant culture and social institutions. Some of these young people are seeking and have created alternative socializing communities--communes, religious sects, Eastern, or fundamentalist Christian, or a political community that embodies distinctive philosophies and life styles. Others seek further education outside a traditional educational system which many in that category have found functionless. Some are simply downwardly mobile for complicated reasons that involve their natural abilities, attitudes, energies, aspirations, values, the family dynamics and relationships with their parents, and various combinations of those forces.

Insofar as middle class or upper working class youth drop out and live in communes and become Jesus Freaks or Moonies or attach themselves to universities as resident nonstudents, they are not having problems that clearly call for some kind of public concern and intervention. Some youth in that category do in fact have problems which might be aided by public programs for youth. To the extent that they have special problems with drugs, alcoholism, or tendencies to suicide, or when some are likely to run away from home, there may be programs that could be of some help to them. Those are characteristically programs that deliver some service to youth in need. It is not clear that the needs of that group are primarily in financial aid or that they would be attracted to broad comprehensive programs in national service, or even the smaller programs designed to meet their needs or harness their talents. Their alienation from society may lead them to

look with special cynicism and hostility at any governmental response of programs of work and service. But if such programs were created, they might over time lose their negative association with the establishment and prove attractive to young, idealistic men and women who are looking for some form of community, and for values and purposes that would give meaning to their lives. Some youth in that category may find themselves not so deeply estranged from mainstream, and be able to look favorably over time at alternatives to the counterculture which they come to learn imposes its own harsh conditions and heavy duties.

When you look at the disadvantaged, you see a group that presents the most soluble problems. Those are young men and women with personal academic skills and motivations, and in most cases family encouragement. What they need is money, and in some cases public services translate their potential to adult achievement. They need ways, for example, to connect themselves and their first jobs to the primary labor market. It is that group that provides new students in post-secondary education who profit most from state and Federal scholarship programs, from low-cost loans and inexpensive community and state colleges. People in that category are perhaps the best candidates for various kinds of nontraditional education, such as work-study programs, and nonresidential post-secondary education, also for educational and career counseling. Young people in that category also need and put to good use public athletic facilities and youth clubs. Such recreational groups have important latent functions. They provide information and advice about education and job opportunities as well as vital forms of social support for individuals who may find themselves relatively isolated in their communities and who are upwardly mobile. One of the most serious problems for youth who are motivated but poor is to gain some protection for themselves and their clubs and organizations against antisocial youth who often live in close proximity. That is an especially difficult problem for minority group members in American central cities. The widespread use of Catholic parochial schools by non-Catholic minority youth often at considerable sacrifice to their parents as a way of getting an education not available in the public school system is an illustration of the response that some people in that category make to the pressures of a hostile environment. A major problem for public policy is to find ways to protect and insulate such youth from antisocial pressures in their own environment. The burden, again, must fall primarily on the family. But for the age group that I am speaking of, public agencies ought to be able to help young people, both through subsidies and services to realize and fulfill their own talents and aspirations.

One difficulty in the recent past in this country has been the existence among upper and upper middle class people of a radical chic which romanticized the most hostile and militant group of minorities while denigrating the performance of the ambitious minority group as Uncle Toms. I think that attitude is less common today than it was a few years ago, though there continue to be certain affinities between certain romantic attitudes toward work and leisure about the middle class people and the styles of the alienated and deprived ghettoes that neither of them share with children of "respectable working and lower middle classes" of any race or ethnic group. There are still ideologues who hold modern contempt for the ambitious minority group's false consciousness, for their lack of militant hostility towards social institutions as repressive instruments of an exploitative society. Those biases can still be seen in contemptuous references to young people who take jobs dishing out hamburgers, or have other low-status jobs which have little glamour and do not lead anywhere. In discussions of youth and programs for youth, there is often implicit the notion that the only legitimate aim of such a program is to place all youth in professional or at least white-collar career jobs comparable to those held by the speaker. The cultural gap between intellectual and academic commentators on this problem on one hand and the children of the respectable poor on the other is at least a potential barrier to good public policy.

In the category of the deprived are to be found young men and women who have the most severe and difficult problems of roles and maturation, who are at once most in need of help from private and public sources and are least able to seek it out or apparently to profit from it when it is offered. For those youth, a combination of poverty, inadequate education and weak psychological resources together result in a litany of human and social disaster—high rates of criminal activity, drug and alcohol addiction, chronic unemployment, physical and mental illness, dependence on public welfare and institutionalization. Anything that we or the state can do that has any promise of reducing the human and social costs of such deprivation is worth considering. Society currently spends very large sums, as you know, on these youth, on police forces, jails, prison systems with probation and parole. I am talking of huge programs and on other forms of support. The real costs of deprivation are infinitely great--a threat to urban life, street crime and the loss to society of the deprived's potential contributions are only the greatest of these hidden costs.

When the numbers of the deprived are relatively small or where they are scattered among the larger population, they can be addressed individually. Then we can begin to think about the institutions which would have a dual but very difficult function of carrying out adult socialization and education under conditions of compulsion; that is, to make human correctional programs and institutions. The problem is greatly exacerbated when large numbers of deprived youth live in close proximity, as in a central city, and create informal institutions, associations in the subculture of delinquency. There are many debates among students about the nature and strength of those subcultures and the degree to which they stand opposed to the dominant values of the surrounding societies. There is no question in my mind that those subcultures sustain their own attitudes toward work and toward criminal activity of various kinds. They tend also to dominate morally and physically the overcrowded correctional institutions, canceling or reversing the impact, if any, of each socializing agency. One of the chief problems that the deprived inflict on others in society is street crime; the chief problem the deprived experience is unemployment or underemployment. Considering the definite difficulty of lack of success in efforts to reach and modify the behavior of deprived youth through the provision of welfare services, it is not surprising that many observers should stress the importance for deprived youth of programs that would lead to high rates of employment.

For the deprived, like youth in every category that I have described, are not a homogeneous group, but they vary among themselves to the degree of their deprivation. Many are only marginally weaker in education, skill, personal qualification than are their disadvantaged counterparts. It is common knowledge that those youths suffer disproportionately from high unemployment rates. They are the last hired, the first to be laid off. For many deprived youth, work is the only training and socializing experience of any effectiveness. We know, for example, that of the very large numbers of youth who commit juvenile crimes or otherwise are identified as juvenile offenders, the great majority do not go on to a life of crime as adults. They settle down and get jobs, get married; they are all more or less successful. It would be very helpful to know more than we do about how and why some deprived youth make a more or less successful transition to adult life in society, while others seemingly from identical family and community backgrounds become a semi-permanent deprived population who cannot almost under any circumstances get and hold a regular job, even the kind of unskilled jobs for which they may qualify. I do not know how large this hard corps

may be; we do not know much about them in all sorts of respects. But for policy purposes, the problems of deprived youth who can get and hold legitimate jobs and of those who cannot are very different. For the former, the problem may lie chiefly in the labor market, and the more objective and most effective government programs may lie in efforts to create better markets for thier services, whether in stimulating the economy at large or through job subsidies or job creating programs or even better training and counseling programs. But there are others whose problems are most intractable, and we in society now deal with them largely through the machinery of crimin[illegible] justice and correction, courts and prisons with conspicuous lack of success. I am suggesting that the problems of this subcategory of deprived youth, both those problems that they pose for themselves and those that they pose for the larger society, are not met by current Federal training and employment programs but we have not discovered any very good alternatives. I think that for such young people we have to search for quite different kinds of socializing and resocializing agencies in alternative quasi-family settings. What forms those might take, we see them in small numbers here and there, and whether they can be created on the enormous scale commensurate with the extent of the problem are in my mind very uncertain, and I would think perhaps the greatest challenge of public policy.

Now, this simple typology that I have suggested is intended to disaggregate this category of youth in ways that might be relevant to the design of public policy. It ought to be clear from our discussion of the deprived that further disaggregation might be necessary; one begins to think of clients or targets of the youth programs and policies. The typology might also provide a way of classifying existing programs in terms of their clientele. For example, as I think I have said, the Peace Corps in the past has recruited the advantaged often to very great advantage of their clientele overseas; VISTA, a combination of advantaged and disadvantaged; the Job Corps, a combination of advantaged, of disadvantaged and deprived, etc. We may be able to understand some of the problems or successes and failures of programs in part in terms of fit between intended and actual clientele in these typological terms; second, in terms of the problems that are generated by different configurations of types in different programs; finally, in terms of the effects of changes in that mix over time and the problems associated with those changes.

The typology also allows us to focus on the type of program and to consider the quite different forms that it might take, does take, when it is aimed at different types. To take one example, we might talk about vocational training. When it is directed at the advantaged, it is likely to be lodged in formal educational institutions with all the advantages and disadvantages that that entails. It is also caught up in the tension of many schools between liberal and vocational education, tension which affects the character of the vocation that is offered and the kinds of teachers and students recruited for those programs. The dichotomy of the liberal and vocational also conceals a very large vocational component in most liberal arts programs, which prepare students not for specific jobs but for at least the possibility of continuing education in an occupational structure that changes rapidly over a lifetime working career. In addition, the problem of vocational higher education tends not to be how to train people up to minimum employment skill levels, but rather the problem is how to deal with the surplus of highly trained people for whom there are not enough rewarding and demanding jobs. When we look at the vocational programs aimed at the alienated, the issue of publicly supported or provided vocational training is complicated by the elusiveness of the target population, many of whom distrust official programs. What public programs, if any, are perceived as officially designed to be used by alienated youth? There are some health programs, but there are also some programs that connect with countercultural values, for example, the training in California of nurse-midwives for home delivery of babies. For the disadvantaged and the deprived, we can see very sharp differences between vocational training programs for motivated and moderately well equipped disadvantaged groups and similar programs for deprived youth, which to work at all, have to include some basic elements of socialization, the effort to shape basic social skills and attitudes. Programs for the disadvantaged may not need that basic socialization component. For deprived youth that basic kind of socialization may require special living arrangements and the learning community. For juvenile offenders, vocational training requires a measure of compulsion and all the added complication that compulsion creates for resocialization, the inherent dilemma of people who very much need some help in basic ways and who are highly resistent and for whom we apply forms of compulsion. We know from other sources the complications that are engendered by compulsion in the relationships between teachers and those taught.

Let me make the transition to an examination of a certain aspect of public policies and ways they connect with the labor market. On the whole, in this country and most other advanced industrial societies, public policy is directed at preparing youth as quickly as possible for what economists call "the primary labor market," regular, secure, reasonably well-paying jobs with a future. In fact, many, many young people both in Europe and the United States do not enter the primary labor market directly after leaving school, but they spend some period of time in the secondary labor market, where jobs are characterized by low pay, by little or no fringe benefits, and by little chance for advancement. Moreover, quite apart from any cyclical or structural reason, job changing in that secondary market is so high that at any given level of employment it is associated with a much higher level of what they call "frictional unemployment" than is the primary sector. In a sense, therefore, high levels of turnover and frictional unemployment may be taken as a characteristic of the secondary labor market.

These jobs at often low wages and marginal enterprises and in casual, unstructured work opportunity are the jobs where workers with employment disadvantages tend to work. They are also jobs in which youth who may not otherwise be disadvantaged find work, in part precisely because of their relatively weak attachment to the labor market and the attractiveness of such jobs to young people. Young people without any particular disadvantage may take jobs to which they are not strongly attached, without much interest in their chances for advancement nor much concern about an unattractive work environment. Doeringer and Piore observe that these youth tend to be employed in jobs which share many of the characteristics of those available to the disadvantaged workers. They suggest, therefore, that it is not the existence of secondary employment per se that constitutes a policy problem. The secondary labor market may be quite appropriate for workers for whom the job itself is a secondary aspect of their lives, whose income requirements are limited, as in the case of teenagers without families, or who foresee eventual access to primary employment. It is the permanent and involuntary employment in the secondary market of workers with major family responsibilities that poses the problem for public policy.

If we focus on youth, the policy problem may lie not exclusively or even primarily in the transition from school to work where governments and official spokesmen so heavily focus their efforts and attention, but at least as much on the transition of youth from the secondary to the primary labor market, which

may occur from 5 to 10 years after young people leave high school. In the United States, I think most young people accomplish this transition without government aid. They enter and remain in the secondary market more or less voluntarily, seeing in their low attachment to the job and its low expectations on them a certain freedom--freedom to remain in school or college, or to drop in and out of school, or to try out different kinds of jobs and occupations in different parts of the country, and also to enjoy the pleasures of the youth culture without responsibilities or commitments. At some point, often in their mid-twenties, such young people come to want the better pay, the job security, and the opportunities for advancement that mark the primary market. And they then enter it, often at the same time taking on added family and financial responsibilities that tie them more securely to their primary market jobs and, indeed, to specific firms. Disadvantaged and deprived youth also enter the secondary market for its casualness, its acceptance of weak job discipline and high job turnover, the relative ease of getting and leaving such jobs and their usefulness in establishing eligibility for unemployment insurance and foodstamps. But where for advantaged youth the secondary market is seen to be and usually is temporary and interspersed with periods of schooling and travel and the like, for the deprived and disadvantaged youth, it may not be temporary. It threatens to become permanent and more likely to be interspersed and supplemented by hustling and by illegal activities than by schooling and travel. That accounts for the very different pictures one can draw of work in the secondary labor market. On the one hand is a rather benign picture of a loosely structured work culture combined with unemployment compensation, easy access to inexpensive schools or part-time education or training together with wandering, beer parties, surfing, drugs--the whole of youth culture, to betray my California origins. Steve Bailey has suggested that in the minds of many young people serious responsibility will come soon enough and will last a long time, and he asks only partially ironically, does not youth's very resilience make them the age cohort most able to bear the uncertainties and disutilities of a soft labor market? But Bailey then quickly notes that that is a distorted picture of reality for many Americans and especially for those who cannot assume that their participation in poor-paying, insecure and "dead-end jobs" in the secondary labor market will be temporary, merely one aspect of the freedom of late adolescence in America, to be distinguished from and replaced by real jobs when they settle into their true adult roles. Thus, I

think you need to analyze much more sharply than we have the meanings and functions of the secondary job market, the different ties with it, specifically for advantaged, disadvantaged, alienated, and deprived.

Maybe a very great deal of the significance of youthful employment, both for individuals and for the larger society, centers on how different segments of this population of youth use the transitory and the ephemeral job opportunities of the secondary labor market. But we also have to look more closely at the variety of jobs and work that make up this secondary labor market. It may be that some kinds of jobs in the secondary market give young people responsibilities, experience in working with other people, experience in getting to work regularly and on time, and other useful skills and habits. Many of the jobs held by young people in fast-food chains may in fact perform some of those mentioned functions. But there are other kinds of work in the secondary labor market, jobs which teach attitudes and habits that are not helpful to future occupational careers, but are downright inimical to future employment. Doeringer and Piore observe that while only low levels of job skills are developed in secondary employment, certain modes of behavior and thought are encouraged in such employment. Since that behavior is rewarded in much the same way that conventional skills are rewarded in other work environments, it can become habitual. Those modes of behavior are in other words learned and when they are antagonistic to employment in the primary sector, they have to be unlearned if the worker is to transfer successfully out of the secondary market. Thus, for example, the very fact that so many secondary jobs accept lateness or absenteeism and adapt to it tends to encourage unstable, erratic job attachment among workers. Similarly, some secondary employers anticipate that their employees will steal and rather than attempting to prevent it, the employers accept the fact that it occurs, turn their backs and adjust wages down accordingly. Where supervision is harsh or abusive and there is no institutionalized process for resolving grievances, employees often relate to their supervisors in a manner that in a primary job would be considered insubordinate. Employers expecting workers to be unskilled purchase either very durable or very cheap second-hand machinery and accept the careless treatment that it receives. As a result, such young workers usually become accustomed to treating machinery carelessly and can neither understand nor accept the greater respect afforded tools and equipment in primary employment. To some extent, all workers in the secondary sector learn behavior traits on the job. In this sense, the disadvantaged involuntarily confined to such work may

not be very different from the student, the working mother or the moonlighter on the same job. However, the advantaged secondary workers tend to come from environments which foster different behavioral traits, and this may weaken the bad habits which develop at work. For a great many disadvantaged or deprived workers, on the other hand, the habits which are developed at the workplace may exist in the home and social environment as well.

There is another segment of modern economies, both here and abroad, which deserves some reference. It is a labor market of special importance to youth, which is for the most part a special segment of this secondary labor market; that is, a hidden or subterranean economy, a part of the economy that is unregulated, untaxed, untracked. Peter Gutman, an economist at the City University of New York, estimates that that subterranean economy of nonreported income, nonreported work may account for about 10% of our gross national product, which he translates as over 800 jobs. While many of the jobs are held by people who also hold recorded jobs, many are held by people who are officially unemployed. This segment of the economy, untaxed, unregulated, untracked, includes, though it is much more than that, the economy of illegal activity, the economy of bookmaking, numbers operations, organized car theft, shoplifting, the drug traffic, and many other forms of mostly nonviolent, but often highly lucrative, illegal activities. Like many of the other kinds of work in the subterranean economy, people who engage in these illegal activities also often hold legal jobs. Of course, the whole of the hidden economy in a sense is illegal, at least in respect to evasion of taxes, and also in other respects as well. These jobs also go unreported and permit their holders to collect unemployment insurance, to work for less than the minimum wage, and also to avoid paying other obligatory fringe benefit taxes. But the activities themselves are often innocent, for example, all kinds of construction work, house painting, various forms of freelance craft and service work of all kinds. The illegal aspect of the subterranean economy differs from the economy of the primary and secondary labor markets. The two are similar as far as the participation of youth is concerned, but subterranean jobs are for the most part unreported and thus not reflected in employment and unemployment statistics. In the United States, the economy of crime is part of this much larger hidden or subterranean economy.

The subterranean economy, the illegal economy itself, is a substantial one, and that certainly affects and distorts our unemployment statistics for youth as it does for adults, thereby affecting the policies and programs for youth that are predicated on those data. Far more important, the economy of crime, like

the larger hidden economy, is an important alternative both to legal employment, especially in the secondary labor market, and to alternative youth programs that public agencies may adopt. In the large and careful study of unemployment in 30 American cities done in the late '60s that you may know of, Stanley Friedlander observes that as an alternative to the legitimate dual market, the illegal labor market offers considerable incentive to many residents of slum areas. Crime and hustling can provide higher incomes, more status and prestige, more exciting work, and better hours and working conditions than the low-wage, casual sectors. Moreover, this illegal market may be of sufficient size to affect the extent to which and the ways in which slum residents participate in the regular dual market. Friedlander continues: The illegal market is large and successful, if it provides alternative job opportunities to ghetto dwellers; it should have definite impact on slum employment although its effect on measured unemployment is quite another matter. He concludes: It is not important to obtain a precise estimate of the income received by the residents of slum areas from illegal business activities. What is essential is to recognize that illegal activities supply substantial income to residents of poverty areas as well as other members of the urban population. The impact and consequences of this illegal money and employment on labor force behavior and on wage rates, taxation, and manpower and poverty programs are not known and must be examined carefully. Government programs and policies and the regular, legitimate labor market cannot compete effectively with the opportunities offered in the illegal marketplace. It cannot be profitable to pursue economic, educational and manpower policies that do not recognize problems and barriers presented by the opportunities in the illegal economy.

It is therefore a little surprising to find no mention in most government publications on youth and youth inemployment of this world of unreported or illegal activities, a significant factor in the employment of youth in our central cities; for example, the report to the Congressional Budget Office on Youth. It is not clear why unreported or illegal activities are not more systematically taken into account. It may be that the whole issue of youth crime and illegal activities has become deeply implicated in the politics of race and has become such a touchy subject that public agencies are not able freely to discuss it or its implications for employment and unemployment. It may also be that official agencies tend to rely on hard, official statistics and are reluctant to introduce issues on which there are no good data, and many problems of interpretation of what little there are. But in a way, that is a great pity, because as one might note, without

moralizing at all, illegal employment and its economic and other rewards constitute an important element affecting the success of policy and programs desiring to help youth in their transition to adult roles.

In thinking about this talk, I intended to discuss at this point some of the political and administrative problems of programs for youth and especially federally funded programs as I have been seeing them over this past summer as they actually appear and work in local areas. I want to do that to illustrate my general point of interconnectedness of different perspectives on youth problems. I cannot take the time that I do not have to do any more than touch on one of these problems, merely by way of illustration. These problems arise out of a set of issues involving how these programs work in the field at the level of the prime sponsor and the subcontractor on the job site. There has been very little written about youth programs at that level, I hope we can say yet. The difficulties and complexities of youth programs in cities and counties, mayors' advisory committees, the community organizations, and on the job are not captured in the official paper, whether they be the self-monitoring reports by the agencies involved or the evaluations coming out of regional offices which concern themselves largely and properly with whether the prime sponsors or their agents meet their employment targets and get most of the money in the hands of the mutual clients rather than to a staff.

Behind that official paper lies a host of fascinating and important questions, important not just to the student of youth or of government, but to those like ourselves who are really concerned with what effects these Federal programs have, and the forces and conditions that enhance or inhibit those effects. Take just one example. There is a very close connection between Federal programs, and local county and city politics. Federal youth programs are now inevitably and deeply involved in local politics, and especially ethnic politics. In many cities the two are essentially identical. What we have administering these programs is a network of community based organizations linked on one hand to ethnic communities, on the other to city or county hall. These programs provide an important part of the patronage by way of jobs and careers which tie these agencies to their communities on the one hand and to local government on the other. The question arises: which agencies get funded and which ones do not? There are a number of factors in our observations, a good many of which can be summarized with track records. If an agency has a good track record, it is re-funded. Of course, most funding is re-funding, which is an illustration of the ancient general principle that most

politics is incremental. An agency's track record is really a record of past performance. The question arises: when did it all begin? We have not been able to solve that question. In many places, the present structure of ethnic politics seems to have been laid down in its broad outlines a decade or more ago around model cities and other Great Society programs, so that the way Federal funds are distributed among community organizations reflects old struggles and old treaties. What we see in the cities are in fact treaties among community organizations about how Federal funds are going to be administered.

My general point here is that in many cities the way youth programs work today is affected by the kinds of understandings within and between ethnic communities made a decade or more ago. How these Federal youth programs actually work is intertwined with local politics, with the ethnic communities, their internal structures, their relations with one another and with local governments. The question really is, how solid are those treaties? Are they being broken, are they problematic? And in many places the quality of the administration of Federal programs is a function of whether that patronage system is in place, that system which links city hall to the Federal programs. If that is reasonably stable and secure and there is a body of people who are part of it and so forth, then the system seems to work. In any event, if we look very closely at these programs, we may discover that the most important effects of current Federal programs for youth are their effects on the ethnic communities and on ethnic politics of the United States. These effects are going to be more important than the effects on the youth who are the nominal parties. If that is so, we may have to revise our notions of what constitutes success and how we define success in those programs.

Let me sum up. I have been presenting here a simple typology of youth, suggesting that programs for youth will vary sharply depending on what kinds of youth are being served. Another set of questions centers on whether programs ought to be targeted or be designed for the broad spectrum. Second, I glanced at the nature of labor markets for youth, making the general point that the same jobs will have quite different functions for different kinds of youth. I noted, just in passing now, that Federal youth programs are very deeply involved in local politics and their effects are mutual; that is to say, the effects of local politics on Federal programs are discernible and so are the effects very substantial of Federal programs on local politics. I think we need to learn a good deal more

about that before we draw any balance sheet of success or failure of our public policies in this area. The fact that these quite disparate elements have in common is that they all in their various ways influence the success of our policies and programs for youth; and therefore, we have got to take them into account more systematically than we do when we are concerned with youth policy. I said at the start that I wanted to illustrate a method, the effort to approach youth problems and policies from very different perspectives simultaneously. If I have not done that, at least I have reported on some of the issues that have engaged my attention over the past year or so. Thank you for your attention. I appreciate it.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FOLLOWING DR. TROW'S ADDRESS

In the discussion following Dr. Trow's address conference participants commented on and requested further elaboration from Dr. Trow concerning the idea of a national youth service, the two factors underlying Dr. Trow's typology, the typology itself, the transition between the primary and the secondary labor markets, the secondary labor market itself, ethnic politics, and the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. With respect to the concept of a national youth service, Dr. Trow was asked if his disinclination to discuss young people as a homogeneous group made him reluctant to support a policy option of a national youth service. Dr. Trow pointed out that a national youth service would be a program commendable for a healthy diversity among its participants and would avoid the problems of stigmatization. On the other hand, a national youth service could be criticized for spreading public money so widely that disadvantaged and deprived groups fail to receive adequate aid. Dr. Trow concluded his response by saying that he thought the consideration of a national youth service as a possibility most profitable.

When asked to elaborate on the socialization factor underlying his typology of youth, Dr. Trow mentioned cultural unemployment or the reluctance of different groups in society to accept certain kinds of work. Employment and unemployment are not necessarily dichotomous, though that is how we view them. At another point in the discussion, the observation was made that whereas operationalization of the financial factor of the typology should be straightforward, operationalization of the socialization factor could be problematic.

A question was raised regarding what characterizes the relatively rare programs that help the most unfortunate of deprived youth adjust to productive adulthoods. Dr. Trow said that programs which effectively alter life prospects for deprived youth are invariably small programs, and the United States, unfortunately, has a poor record with small-scale efforts. To some extent programs that are successful with deprived youth may depend on charismatic youth workers whose charisma cannot be mass produced. A fear was voiced that the deprived category of the typology threatens to lead into the "blame-the-victim" syndrome. Dr. Trow's reaction to that apprehension, a reasonable statement of the dangers of self-censorship, is quoted in part here.

> I think it is extremely destructive of the whole enterprise of trying to understand things, enlighten ourselves, illuminate problems if we are engaging in self censorship. . . . People do not talk about awkward things when the data fall in ways that they are uncomfortable about associating themselves with, are uneasy about how people may interpret it, and then shift the interpretation of that passage and then somehow all of us are poorer for not having seen certain important implications of the data.

Regarding the transition made by many workers from the secondary to the primary labor market, Dr. Trow reiterated the point made in his keynote address that this transition may be more crucial and more problematic than the school-to-work transition. Employment programs might be more productive when focused on the secondary-primary labor market transition then when focused on the school-to-work transition which is, however, the more common target.

Not only is the secondary labor market the labor market of interest for young workers (advantaged, alienated, disadvantaged and deprived) and for older disadvantaged and deprived workers, but also the secondary labor market is the labor market of interest for women. Jobs traditionally reserved for women are more likely found in the secondary than in the primary labor market. Thus, women tend to be trapped in the secondary labor market and do not make the transition to the primary labor market, finding themselves in a predicament similar to that of many disadvantaged and deprived male workers. There is a sex difference within categories between those who find themselves trapped in the secondary labor market and those who make the transition to the primary labor market, with a higher percentage of women than of men trapped in the secondary labor market.

In reply to a request to elaborate on the ties between the effective execution of Federal programs and ethnic politics, Dr. Trow pointed out that many local agencies justify themselves to communities, including ethnic communities, by providing Federal jobs. These agencies furnish such jobs to whomever they wish, paying only perfunctory attention (if any) to detailed instructions from Washington, D.C., as to who should be employed under one program or another. When asked specifically about participants in the Young Adult Conservation Corps and the Youth Incentive Entitlement Program (both part of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act), Dr. Trow responded that people in the field charged with carrying out Federal programs are not concerned with titles

and subtitles painstakingly forged out in D.C., and people either ignore regulations or learn how to work around them. Dr. Trow suggested that policy makers ask, "What are the incentives for either the prime sponsors or the subcontractors to spend money in the ways that are described in the enabling legislation as over against giving jobs to deserving chaps who are known and are picked up in their networks?"

A number of other important issues were raised in the general discussion following Dr. Trow's address which were less closely related to the address itself. Several of these were employment issues undoubtedly inspired by the nature of the keynote address. Robert Grinder shared his notion that we are currently witnessing a three-fold transition: from an achievement-oriented primary labor market generation to a recreation-oriented generation to a low-level primary labor market generation with little opportunity for either recreation or advancement. Phillip Newman suggested that a young person's orientation and adjustment to work are molded in part by his or her parents' employment experiences as viewed by the young person. The young person's perception of his or her parents' employment will depend on their employment and on how open the parents are about their work-related joys, problems and dilemmas. Ronald Feldman, commenting on earlier discussion that had emphasized the fact that illegitimate employment is often far more lucrative than legitimate salaries, urged that comparisons between illegitimate and legitimate employment take into account costs as well as rewards. Rosemary Sarri bemoaned what she sees as the inadequacy of work opportunities in the United States today, and she advocated that our society become more labor intensive.

Other topics that surfaced in the discussion do not share an obvious relationship, yet are significant subjects in any consideration of youth development and families. Edith Grotberg pointed out that the role of families as the link between youth and ethnic politics is a role of families often overlooked.

In a reflection which turned out to be a preview of the major discussion in the theory workgroup, Rosemary Sarri questioned whether it is more productive to conceptualize adolescence as a period of transition or as a period of life. She suggested that we make transitions throughout our lives, and that that makes it extremely difficult to pinpoint when "adolescence transition" begins and ends.

The question arose as to whether some young people should be invited to represent themselves at a conference on youth. When young people attend youth-

related conferences, to what extent are their comments colored by the conference setting? How does one select youth who will be representative spokesmen for their age group? Professionals are selected to speak at conferences based on their credentials: experience, research, degrees, publications. On what bases would young people be chosen? Would the results of youth polls provide information similar to what might be expected of youth delegates?

Kenneth Polk said that in his experience with youth, the most intractable of youth are not intractable when they have hope. He said that youth who have trouble deferring gratification are youth with no hope of future gratification.

Lorraine Hendricks directed attention to the totality of the real work of an adolescent, the work of becoming a person: of finding work, of discovering one's sexual self, of developing an interpersonal style, of making family and parenthood choices, of developing one's creative resources, and of learning to use leisure time. She suggested that adolescents, and often even the parents of adolescents, have trouble making decisions in our rapidly changing times, and that society must provide community resources to support all ages in "becoming."

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILIES
SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION IN WORKGROUP I

CHAIRPERSONS: Edith Grotberg
Administration for Children, Youth and Families

Anita King
National Institute of Mental Health

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Wendy Baldwin, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; social demography

Beatrix Hamburg, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration; psychiatry

Cheryl Hayes, the National Academy of Sciences; history

Lorraine Hendricks, "the Door," New York City; psychiatry

Esther Rothman, the Livingston Schools, New York City; psychology

Maryann Walters, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic: family therapy

The discussion of the first workgroup included the topics of: (1) definition of family; (2) the diversity of possible orientations that can be taken to research on youth development and families; (3) methodological issues with respect to research on families; and (4) a variety of substantive issues.

In their efforts to examine the American family and youth development, the workgroup participants realized that one cannot talk about the American family due to the lack of homogeneity in the American population. Families differ greatly between subcultural groups, between ethnic groups, between socioeconomic groups; some would even say that families within groups conform to no standard. Although there are many different kinds of families, families share the characteristic of acting as filters between their members and the broader society. The societal messages so filtered, however, differ between subcultural

and detail the clinician can delve into; the disadvantage is the relatively few number of cases the clinician can consider, the lack of standardization in investigative methods, and the restriction to pathological cases.

Six methodological issues with respect to research on the family were discussed in this workgroup. The first and most fundamental question raised was how can one collect valid, interesting data on families: videotape? tape recorder? interview? questionnaire? direct observation? How can one accurately study families' coping techniques? How can the family's effect on the individual be measured and compared to other influences?

Wendy Baldwin pointed out the importance to effective research of careful conceptualization. Thoughtful conceptualization of a research problem should precede methodological planning because if you know the question, you can usually find a way to get the answer.

The third concern voiced was interest in longitudinal research paired with awareness of the difficulties both of funding longitudinal research and of designing longitudinal research without funding. A longitudinal research design presents the only means of answering many research question such as what leads to tension in families and what resolves tension in families.

Frustration was expressed about the tendency in the social sciences today to value only data that has been gathered in a strictly standardized manner and that can be quantified in a straightforward way. Standardizing data collection techniques and requiring definite data measurement often results in the loss of information. Workgroup participants voiced the hope that creative methodologies in the social sciences will receive consideration equal to that accorded orthodox statistical techniques.

The importance of maintaining a healthy skepticism in carrying out research was also noted. Data do not always indicate what they appear to mean at first glance. Wendy Baldwin mentioned research documenting that daughters of mothers who bore children early in their teenage years are adamant about not wanting to bear children until much later in life. Yet the best predictor of early adolescent child-bearing is having a mother who became a mother in early adolescence. Another set of apparently anomalous findings were the results that in families where parents say they play a major role in the sex education of their children, the children attribute no such role to their parents.

The sixth research issue raised in the workgroup on youth development and families was the issue of the permeation of values in social science research.

groups. All families share bearing the burden of carrying financial responsibility for their members and of socializing (or at least helping to socialize) their young members to become productive adult members of society. The weight of those burdens, however, the stress engendered by those responsibilities, differs greatly between, for example, the affluent for whom financial responsibility need scarcely be noticed and for whom the availiability of effective public or private schools is unquestioned, and the poor who struggle to meet grocery bills and for whom effective schools are not part of reality. Workgroup participants expressed an interest in identifying the distinguishing characteristics of families which successfully cope with problems compared to families which fail to cope.

The orientations to research on youth development and families suggested in the workgroup were: developmental, interactional, historical and clinical. The developmental perspective indicates research questions, such as how do developmental processes of the family influence youth development, and how does adolescents' development influence the developmental processes of their families? Related questions might be, how can service programs help families to foster healthy youth development and help adolescents facilitate healthy family development?

The interactional perspective encourages a dynamic research approach. Methodologies must be deyeloped that can take into account several factors at one time in order to research the total ecology of any situation. The adolescent and his or her family are a system in interaction. The young person's value system is substantially influenced by his or her family just as he or she has a substantial effect on the family's value system, and the values of both the family and the young person are colored by the society and the historical period in which they live.

The historical perspective emphasizes consideration of differences between historical periods and the significance of these differences for families and youth. The family today faces the task of helping the adolescent go out from the family, whereas it used to be the family's responsibility to help the adolescent learn to function effectively within the family. The family's responsibility to teach young people values is more difficult to carry out than formerly when families and society shared more homogeneous values. The age segregation present in today's society presents another challenge to the family in its role of socializing the young as does the infiltration of the family by the media.

The fourth perspective mentioned in the Workgroup on Youth Development and Families was the clinical. The advantage of the clinical perspective is the depth

The workgroup participants affirmed the importance of researchers' having the intellectual integrity to be aware of and state their biases. Related to the issue of values in research is the matter of policy implications of much research on children and youth.

Substantive points raised in Workgroup I included: (1) separation of youth from families; (2) the reversed roles of adolescents as teachers and parents as students; (3) sex education; (4) adolescent child-bearing; (5) the implications of laws for young people and their families; and (6) research related to service programs. Workgroup participants felt that we need research on how young people manage the separation from their families and on what supports a family provides during the separation process. Also discussed was the fact that in a rapidly changing world, children in many areas may be more informed than their parents and, therefore, that adolescents often have to learn to play the role of teachers to their parents as their parents have to learn the role of students. The importance of sex education was cited, and it was suggested that the availability of sex education for parents might be worthwhile, especially in communities that are not ready to offer sex education to their young people.

Adolescent child-bearing received major attention in this Workgroup on Youth Development and Families. Wendy Baldwin shared much of her work on the subject. Recent increases in adolescent child-bearing are apparently not so much the result of a higher incidence of adolescent pregnancy as of an increase of decisions by young mothers to keep their babies. Research on the consequences of early motherhood indicates that it has a devastating impact on a woman's educational and employment future. Young mothers who do not marry, however, are far more likely to continue their education than those who do marry. The extended families (especially grandmothers) of young mothers, especially of those who do not marry, provide support and child care. To date, there is no research on the effect of adolescent child-bearing on the extended family, nor of the effect of the extended family's support and involvement on the young mother or on the infant's development. Those young fathers who play an active fathering role are not necessarily those who urged the mothers to keep the babies. The characteristic which seems to predict and explain whether or not the young father will be an active father is the strength of the father's interest in the mother. In cases where the father is interested in the young mother, he plays an active fathering role. According to Esther Rothman, young fathers urge young mothers to keep their babies due to

peer pressure to become adult. Rothman emphasized a need for research on young fathers and also on the effects of the relative ages of young parents: both parents young, younger mother and older father, older mother and younger father.

Another interest of the workgroup was for research on the implications of laws and governmental policies for families and their youth. To what extent do laws and policies work in harmony with relationships between youth and their families? To what extent do laws and policies ignore such relationships and view youth as autonomous?

Research on service programs was another strong interest in this workgroup. Need was seen for both "top-down" research, which asks, what are the services offered, and the "bottom-up" approach, which asks, what services are needed. One type of service the workgroup participants felt is needed is comprehensive services: nonresidential, comprehensive, nurturing, supportive services. Lorraine Hendricks of "the Door" in New York City described her program, which is a comprehensive service center for adolescents. She said the most common entrance points for clients to the program are medical services, creative workshops, and alternative education. These, then, may be the most commonly perceived needs of adolescents. Psychiatry is the most common in-house cross-referral.

Edith Grotberg pointed out that one reason that there are not more comprehensive service programs funded is because to get a program legislated, it has to be categorical because both Congress and the Executive Branch bureaucracies think in categorical terms. Also, there are restrictions outlawing the pooling of money for comprehensive services.

Finally, workgroup participants called for research on what kinds of practitioners (i.e., doctors, teachers, counselors) work with adolescents and on what these practitioners offer adolescents.

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE LARGER SOCIETY
SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION IN WORKGROUP II

CHAIRPERSONS: Donald J. Eberly
ACTION

Lana Muraskin
National Institute of Education

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Larry L. Dye, Director, Youth Development Bureau; education

Ronald Feldman, School of Social Work, Washington University; social work and sociology

Richard Graham, Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.; psychology

Elliot Medrich, Children's Time Study, School of Law, University of California at Berkeley; city planning

Ken Polk, Marion County Youth Study, Eugene, Ore.,; sociology

The workgroup participants engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of many aspects of youth development in the context of the larger society. Topics of particular interest and lengthy exploration were the quality of youth service programs, local involvement, public schools, alternative conceptualizations of youth development, labeling of antisocial youth, and means of stimulating and funding innovative research.

The session began with representatives from three Federal agencies describing their current efforts in youth participation. Larry Dye explained that much of the Youth Development Bureau's money will be spent on demonstration projects for capacity building in service delivery youth programs. Additional research funds will be expended on runaway youth. Lana Muraskin, of the National Institute for Education, described the single request for proposal (RFP) which her agency has issued in the area of youth participation. The RFP contains three parts: the first examines the history and process of spending on youth programs by Federal, state and local governments; the second deals with teenage pregnancy and parent-

hood, particularly with how schools respond to pregnant girls and their parents; and the third looks at the overall development of services to youth.

David Muchnik, of ACTION, detailed his agency's two major thrusts--national youth service and youth community service. Specific aspects of national youth service to be researched are the desirability of voluntary vs. compulsory programs and the benefits to youth, their communities and the involved institutions. An alternative model is youth community service, a decentralized community-based program with no national administrative structure beyond funding. Muchnik reported on a current youth community service demonstration project in Syracuse funded by the Department of Labor under an experimental youth employment program.

The participants then engaged in a multifaceted discussion of the components of quality in youth service programs. One participant raised the issue of "burn-out" in teachers and youth workers who cease to be effective after several years of working with youth. Several participants pointed out that it is the organizational structure, not the intensive contact with young people, which causes the burn-out. Contributing factors on which more research is needed are the low status and low pay of youth workers, lack of a professional association to speak for youth workers, quality of supervision, charismatic leadership, training of youth workers and supervisors, organizational flexibility and alienation at all levels.

There was also some discussion about the nature of local involvement but no clear agreement on research issues. Participants felt strongly that local involvement and initiative are crucial to the success of service programs, but they see few instances of this. Rather, there is at the local level little understanding of Federal purposes and at the Federal level little responsiveness to local input. Bryna Fraser, of the National Manpower Institute, described her group's Work Education Consortium Project and advocated local community councils as a forum for collaboration among Federal and state government and local organizations. Kenneth Polk and David Muchnik talked about another aspect of local involvement--the tendency for established institutions such as the political machines, juvenile courts and school systems to use Federal monies to perpetuate their own assumptions and operations and to discourage innovation. Elliott Medrich commented on the multidimensional problem of disaffection he has encountered in his work with school administrators, teachers, parents and students. He senses that at each level "there is really no connection . . . between the point at which the problems are

identified and have to be dealt with and the point at which funds come down for services."

Several participants argued that the public school system should be included in research on youth participation. The impact of the teaching staff on the climate of a school and the self-perception of the students was singled out as a major area needing more research by both Laurabeth Hicks and Arthur Cole.

Running through the workgroup session was the theme of revising the traditional approach to youth development. Both researchers and Federal project officers wanted to move away from a deficiency-based or pathological view of young people to a "prosocial" or proactive" approach, although there were few indications of the components of this alternative. Muchnik explained that under the pathological view of youth development it is the youth who are at fault, not the general economic system or some other factor, and therefore the only policy conclusion is to become more repressive. He believes young people have the potential to gain political power by allying themselves with the beneficiaries of their involvement, such as senior citizens.

Polk repeatedly stressed the need for research defining the positive dimensions of youth development and the concomitant positive agency programs. While he favored more labor intensive means of production in general, he was against recreating the Civilian Conservation Corps of the Depression, because it would not be based on a contemporary analysis of the persistence of youth unemployment. Joan Lipsitz identified some conceptual gaps which she believed must be filled before further research may be done on alternative views of youth development. She was concerned with differentiating between prevention and crisis intervention, determining the nature and extent of government responsibility for the healthy development of adolescents, and discovering the link between the period of early adolescence and the events of later years.

There was a strong feeling among the participants that antisocial youth should not be labeled and segregated from prosocial, or normal, youth because of the adverse consequences for the self-esteem of those in the negatively labeled group. Both Polk and Ronald Feldman reported on their research into the socialization of antisocial young people. In his work in Australia, Polk found that negatively labeled migrant youth given meaningful work such as tutoring their peers can function very effectively. Feldman's findings from his experiment integrating antisocial youth into groups of prosocial youth are two-fold--the

antisocial youth become increasingly prosocial and, more importantly for the educational debates on racial segregation and mainstreaming, the prosocial youth suffer no ill effects.

The last third of the session focused on means of stimulating and funding alternative and innovative research into youth development. Muraskin saw in her own agency a reluctance to risk program success by funding a variety of untested models. Medrich felt the university community often has difficulty responding to the felt needs of government because academic research interests do not necessarily have a direct relationship to Federal program priorities. Polk argued against spending large amounts of money on large projects; he would prefer to see a few small, well-designed, highly conceptualized programs funded for $20,000 each. Feldman observed that government funding sources are influential in shaping the structure and agendas of research, particularly interdisciplinary approaches. He suggested that Federal agencies write regulations requiring in certain cases teams of researchers from at least two disciplines.

Harry Lieberman advocated making a national commitment to youth development similar to the effort to land a man on the moon spearheaded by NASA in the '60s. He envisioned a commission or agency acting as a focal point for all research and programs and having an overall concept and long-range guaranteed funding. Betsy Guthrie proposed that because youth development spans many executive departments, Congress may be the most appropriate source of funding for a large-scale simulation or demonstration project, as was the case in the New Jersey negative income tax experiment. However, Kathleen Keest, of the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, was not optimistic about the possibility of more funding for youth programs, partly because of the lack of a defined constituency for youth.

Several times during the afternoon Dr. Feldman effectively distilled research issues from the general discussion. His list of areas for further research included field experimentation, social indicators, transition to adulthood, labor market entry, renovation of unproductive youth services such as Boy Scouts, interdisciplinary research, knowledge dissemination, optimum distribution of Federal funds for maximum impact and school board operation and training. Other participants argued for more research on early adolescence, labor intensive means of production, contextual variables, such as age and neighborhood, large-scale demonstrations, surveys on attitudes toward youth and the role of religion in the black community.

THEORY OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION IN WORKGROUP III

CHAIRPERSON: Richard Myrick
National Institute on Drug Abuse

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Robert Grinder, College of Education, Arizona State University; human development

Rolf Muuss, Goucher College; educational psychology

Phillip Newman, Author; psychology

Sally Ryan, Boys' Town Center, Catholic University; psychology

Rosemary Sarri, School of Social Work, University of Michigan; social work and sociology

Lack of consensus was the predominant characteristic of this workgroup that focused attention on theory of youth development, and that lack of consensus may be the most accurate commentary possible concerning the state of the art with respect to theory of youth development. As one would expect with a group of theoreticians, the discussion opened with controversy over relevant concepts. As a matter of fact, workgroup participants devoted close to one-third of their efforts to resolving conceptual issues, but arbitarily moved on to other matters when conceptual agreement appeared impossible. Some participants felt that adolescence and youth are separate developmental stages while at least one person felt that they cannot be operationally distinguished. Another basic, unresolved question was, are there distinct stages of development? One participant suggested that we should talk about dimensions rather than stages of development. If there are developmental stages, how many are there and how should they be distinguished: by age? by task (i.e., becoming a parent makes a person an adult)? by law (one is an adult legally at 18)? by characteristics (if so, which ones)? The participants discussed whether or not universal developmental stages exist which can be defined socially, culturally and scientifically. One person felt that the genetic and epigenetic stages of Erikson, Piaget and

Kohlberg have retarded theory of youth development at least partly by ignoring the malleability of human personality development and the role of culture.

The next major task workgroup participants tackled after their conceptual efforts was theory building. There did seem to be agreement that the study of adolescent development lacks and needs testable theories, but what method to use to arrive at such theories was more problematic. Some participants argued that theorizing should be based on research and knowledge while at least one participant supported armchair theorizing. Genetic and epigenetic theories were criticized as deluding scholars into thinking they have all the answers when they actually do not.

Another topic of some interest in the Workgroup on Theory of Youth Development was the role of culture in youth development. The historical perspective tends to highlight the role of culture in youth development. For example, Rosemary Sarri pointed out that today adolescent runaways are considered a social problem, but in 1875, when there were three times as many runaways as in 1975, running away was not defined as a social problem and was in fact encouraged. The participants debated to what extent adolescence is a product of modern industrial society and to what extent it has always been a definable stage in the life cycle. A related issue was how rapid changes in society affect youth development. In a rapidly changing society culture becomes more of a variable even within a single culture. Some participants, however, suggested that the rapidity of change in our society may be exaggerated. One of the ways that societal changes affect youth development is by changing the family: these family changes then change the course of youth development.

The workgroup touched on the subject of role diffusion, and there was a difference of opinion as to whether role diffusion is a healthy means of role experimentation or an unhealthy paralysis of effective functioning. The resolution seemed to be that role diffusion during a part of adolescence serves a useful function in allowing youth to try out a variety of roles, but if it continues too long, it leads into an unhealthy paralysis. The discussion of role diffusion led into talk of "effective floundering" which led to coping skills. The group agreed that the development of effective coping skills is one of the tasks of youth and that the particular coping skills required differs from society to society. Another of the topics debated by the workgroup was whether socialization of youth today is socialization by peers or socialization by family. There was implicit agreement in the group that both peers and family have a socializing

effect on youth; the question which defied resolution was the relative magnitude of the effects of peers and family.

Other topics touched on by the workgroup were: (1) the definition of delinquency and the age of highest incidence of delinquent behavior; (2) which characteristics of youth are intrinsic and which are culturally conditioned; (3) the need of adolescents to have their role in society legitimized by society; (4) the understanding that evaluation of youth development implies a notion of a desired or ideal adulthood; (5) the issue of whether youth is a time of transition or a time unto itself; and finally (6) the dependence-independence continuum, the fact that it is a characteristic of social units as well as individuals, and its significance with respect to youth development.

SUMMARY OF PLENARY SESSION DISCUSSION

As the three workgroups reported on their meetings, the issues and emphases that had surfaced in those meetings were of course reiterated. The total conference group highlighted certain of those topics in their discussion, as will be evident from this summary.

The subject that received the most attention at the plenary session was research priorities. The need was stressed for more creative, dynamic research methodology which would yield data rich with meaning. Resource persons talked about a lack of adequate descriptive research, interdisciplinary work, and experimental research grounded in theory of youth development (including field experimentation). They also bemoaned the tendency for service programs to shape research because such an approach inhibits creative thinking and problem solving. Topics cited as being fruitful and important areas for research on youth included: (1) the ecology of youth development: not just adolescents and their mothers, but adolescents and their mothers and their fathers and their communities; (2) stages of adolescents, of their parents, of their families, and the interactions of all these stages; (3) reciprocity of relationships; (4) social indicators; (5) positive youth development; (6) cross-age interaction; (7) cross-peer interaction; (8) career entry and exit points; (9) family-school linkages; (10) outcome measures for program evaluations; and (11) how to disseminate evaluated, successful, innovative pilot programs.

Need was also seen for tight conceptualization and theory building in the area of youth development. Theory of youth development as it exists today is more closely related to description than to prediction. All theories of youth development to date have emerged out of consideration of white males. Attention should be paid to females and minorities. The data available to support theory building are piecemeal and at times inconsistent; thus considerable work on integrating available information will have to precede theory building. Rosemary Sarri felt that theories and knowledge of delinquency could be put to better use than they have been in advancing theory of youth development. Theoretical approaches to youth development all recognize both the transitional nature of adolescence as well as the uniqueness of that time. No new theories or approaches to theory of youth development are on the horizon at this time.

Positive youth development engendered a good deal of interest in the plenary session. According to the resource persons it is an issue of increasing interest in the field of research on youth. Positive youth development was defined as the development of youth within positive roles. According to various resource persons, youth are often denied positive roles, and the positive approach to youth development involves helping youth find positive roles. Positive youth development was seen as a more useful concept than normal youth development due to difficulties inherent in efforts to define normal.

Some discussion centered on what constitutes a good youth worker and on what support services youth workers need to avoid "burn-out." A related question was, what makes a youth organiztion effective? Other matters addressed included the importance of considering the full range of young people and not just pathological cases, and the need to think about services for youth within a framework of scarcity of resources.

Several comments from resource people during the plenary session concerned the conference itself, its format. There was a general feeling that a day and a half was an inadequate amount of time for the agenda. Ronald Feldman suggested that for a day and a half fewer resource people be invited to attend and be given a more focused topic to discuss, though not a more narrow topic or unidimension topic that would defeat the interagency requirement of the Panel. A more focused topic of interagency interest might by "Research on Positive Youth Development." Another conference topic proposed was "Creative Methodology." With fewer resource persons and a more focused topic, greater closure or resolution could be reached. Another suggestion was that resource people be requested to prepare papers for the conference. Resource persons and conference participants left feeling that although many issues remained unresolved, their thinking on many fronts had been awakened and sharpened.

APPENDIX A

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT and FAMILIES

THE CONFERENCE AGENDA

A Conference Sponsored by

The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence

The Marvin Center
George Washington University
Washington, D.C.
September 18 and 19, 1978

AGENDA

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18

REGISTRATION 9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. Ballroom

MORNING SESSION 9:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon Ballroom

WELCOME - Edith H. Grotberg, Chairperson, Executive Committee of the Interagency Panels

William Daniels, Chairperson, Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence

KEYNOTE ADDRESS - Martin Trow, Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California at Berkeley
"Reflections on Youth and Policies for Youth"

GENERAL DISCUSSION: Critical Issues Concerning Research on Youth

LUNCHEON 12:15 p.m. - 1:15 p.m., University Club, Marvin Center, 3rd Floor, GWU

AFTERNOON SESSION 1:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT MEETINGS OF THE THREE WORKGROUPS:

Workgroup I. YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILIES Room 410-415

This workgroup will pay deserved attention to families within the context of youth development. Discussions of youth development often minimize the role of families, yet research in several areas indicates that parents have a primary influence on their offspring at least through adolescence.

Questions which might be considered include the following.

- What is the role of the family in Youth Development?
- What are the critical variables influencing Youth Development within the context of families?
- What does research indicate about the relationship between families and Youth Development?

- What contribution do theories of Youth Development make to our understanding of the interdependence between families and youth?
- To what extent do families act as filters for societal messages for youth?
- In what areas are families the primary service providers for youth?
- In what areas do families share the responsibility of providing services with other groups?
- Are there areas where the responsibility for the welfare of youth rests entirely outside the family?
- What impact do currently changing aspects of society (the growing number of family forms, changing sex roles) have on the interactions between youth and families?
- How does the distribution of rights and responsibilities evolve between youth and other family members?
- To what extent is youth participation a reality or a possibility within families?
- How do economic fluctuations influence families (particularly youth members)?
- How do families influence the sex role development of adolescents?
- In what ways do ethnicity or minority status affect relationships between youth and families?

CHAIRPERSONS: Edith Grotberg
Administration for Children, Youth and Families

Anita King
National Institute of Mental Health

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Wendy Baldwin, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; social demography

Elizabeth Douvan, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; psychology

Beatrix Hamburg, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration; psychiatry

Cheryl Hayes, the National Academy of Sciences; history

Lorraine Hendricks, "the Door", New York City; psychiatry

Esther Rothman, the Livingston Schools, New York City; psychology

Maryann Walters, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic; family therapy

Workgroup II. YOUTH DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE LARGER SOCIETY Room 426

The core of this session is envisioned as the associations between youth and society with Youth Development as the dependent variable. Any aspect of society may be considered: for examples, programs and services with specific target populations, universal programs and services, the economy, employment (and unemployment), laws and regulations delineating the rights and responsibilities of youth, the media...

Questions to be addressed include the following:

- As pressure for accountability of professionals (e.g., doctors, teachers) has increased, have youth lost some responsibility for themselves? In other words, could we do more for youth by doing less?
- To what extent are our programs for youth reactive? To what extent proactive?
- What might be the differing influences on youth development of programs with specific target populations compared to universal programs?
- Do shifts in the economy influence Youth Development? If so, how? Does the availability of employment have an impact on Youth Development? If so, what is the nature of that impact?
- To what extent is youth participation a reality in our society? A possibility?
- How do families and services interact with each other?
- How does the distribution of rights and responsibilities between youth and those who work with youth evolve?
- How does the larger society influence the sex role development of adolescents?
- What is the effect of ethnicity or minority status on youth development within the context of the larger society?

CHAIRPERSONS: Donald J. Eberly
ACTION

Lana Muraskin
National Institute of Education

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Larry L. Dye, Director, Youth Development Bureau; education

Ronald Feldman, School of Social Work, Washington University; social work and sociology

Richard Graham, Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.; psychology

Elliot Medrich, Children's Time Study, School of Law, University of California at Berkeley; city planning

Ken Polk, Marion County Youth Study, Eugene, Oregon; sociology

Mary Lou Randour, National Institute of Education; human development

Workgroup III. THEORY OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT Room 413-414

In this workgroup theory of Youth Development will be highlighted. Recent and current theoretical work will be assessed.

For instance:

- What are existing approaches to theory of Youth Development?
- What new approaches are being investigated?
- What are the implications of viewing youth as a time of transition as opposed to viewing it as a time unto itself?
- To what extent are hypotheses about Youth Development related hypotheses of deviancy (more specifically juvenile delinquency, dropping out of school, drug abuse)?
- In what ways do current theories of youth development enhance understanding of sex role development?
- What do current theories of youth development indicate about the effect of ethnicity or minority status on youth?

CHAIRPERSON: Richard Myrick
National Institute on Drug Abuse

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Robert Grinder, College of Education, Arizona State University; human development

Rolf Muuss, Goucher College; educational psychology

Phillip Newman, Author; psychology

Sally Ryan, Boys' Town Center, Catholic University; psychology

Rosemary Sarri, School of Social Work, University of Michigan; social work and sociology

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19

PLENARY SESSION 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon. Ballroom

MODERATOR: William Daniels

Reports from the individual workgroups. General discussion and recommendations.

Appendix B

Participants in the Conference on Youth Development and Families

Chairpersons and Resource Persons

Keynote Speaker

Martin Trow
Graduate School of Public Policy
University of California/Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-5040

Workgroup I - Youth Development and Families

Chairpersons:

Edith Grotberg
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
P.O. Box 1182
Washington, D.C. 20013
(202) 755-7750

Anita King
National Institute of Mental Health
Mental Health Service Program
Parklawn Building, Room 11C-09
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857
(202) 443-3668

Resource Persons:

Wendy Baldwin
National Institutes of Health
Landow Building, Room C-725
7910 Woodmont Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
(301) 496-1174

Cheryl Hayes
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20418
(202) 393-8100

Workshop I (cont'd)

Loraine Henricks
"The Door"
618 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10011
(212) 691-6161

Esther Rothman
Livingston School for Girls
and Boys
200 East 16th Street
New York, New York 10003
(212) 674-3030

Maryann Walters
Philadephia Child Guidance Clinic
34th Street and Civic Center Blvd.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
(215) 243-2772

Workshop II - Youth Development Within the Context of the Larger Society

Chairpersons:

Donald J. Eberly
ACTION
806 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Room 606
Washington, D.C. 20525
(202) 254-8420

Lana Muraskin
National Institute of Education
Education and Work
Room 645
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20208
(202) 254-5788

Resource Persons:

Larry L. Dye
Director, Youth Development Bureau
Room 3260, North Building
330 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-2870

Workshop II (cont'd)

Ronald Feldman
53 Queens Garden
Flat 6
London W2
England

Richard Graham
Youthwork, Inc.
805 15th Street, NW
Suite 705
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 347-2900

Elliot Medrich
Children's Time Study
School of Law
Boalt Hall
University of California/Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-0912

Ken Polk
Marion County Youth
1859 East 15th Street
Eugene, Oregon 97403
(503) 686-5041

Workshop III - Theory of Youth Development

Chairperson:

Richard Myrick
National Institute on Drug Abuse
Psychosocial Branch Division of Research
Room 9-31
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857
(301) 443-1263

Resource Persons:

Robert Grinder
Office of the Dean
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281
(603) 965-3306

Workshop III (cont'd)

Beatrix Hamburg
Special Assistant for Children & Youth
ADAMHA
Parklawn Building 13-C-26
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857
(301) 443-3706

Rolf Muuss
Goucher College
Towson, Maryland 21204
(301) 825-3300

Philip Newman
1969 Chatfield Road
U. Arlington, Ohio 43221

Sally Ryan
Boys' Town Center
Catholic University of America
620 Michigan Avenue, NE
Washington, D.C. 20064
(202) 635-5999

Rosemary Sarri
School of Social Work
University of Michigan
1065 Frieze Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
(313) 764-5323

Other Participants

May Aaronson
National Institute of Mental Health

Fannie Alexander
National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke

Sharon Alexander
Washington, D.C.

Jeanne Barnett
Department of Labor

Peggy Berger
Department of Agriculture

Muriel Berkeley
Social Research Group

Phyllis Blaunstein
National Association of State Boards of Education

Molly Boggis
University of North Carolina

Regina Carmel
National Institute of Education

George Coelho
National Institute of Mental Health

Arthur Cole
Teacher Corps, Office of Education, DHEW

Ann Court
National Association of State Boards of Education

Bill Daniels
Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW

Lucy Davis
Duke University

Carolyn Dean
Youth Development Bureau, DHEW

Pat DeBlasi
Columbia School of Social Work

Deborah Dennis
Social Research Group

Allan Dittmann
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, DHEW

Madeline Dowling
Administration for Public Services, DHEW

Margaret Feldman
Adolescent Pregnancy Initiative

Nancy Fischer
White House Conference on Families

Bryna Fraser
National Manpower Institute

Hilary Gardner
Social Research Group

Betsy Guthrie
Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW

Wilma Hazen
American Home Economics Association

Laurabeth Hicks
Office of Education, DHEW

Sheila Hollies
National Institute on Child Health and Human Development, DHEW

Maure Hurt, Jr.
Social Research Group

Jo[illegible] Houghton
Herndon High School/National Institute of Mental Health

Alice Isen
American Psychological Association

Richard Jakopic
Human Development Services, DHEW

Juel Janis
Public Health Services, DHEW

Ronne Kaplan
Office of the Assistant Secretary of Education, DHEW

Kathleen Keest
Washington, D.C.

Dorothy Kelly
National Institute on Drug Abuse

Gontran Lamberty
Bureau of Community Health Services, DHEW

Carolee Lane
Research Triangle Institute

John Lawrence
Research Triangle Institute

Harry Lieberman
Department of Labor

Joan Lipsitz
University of North Carolina

Ruth Lovald
Public Health Services, DHEW

Terry Machiocha
Family Impact Seminar

Bonnie Maguire
Social Research Group

Jim Meyers
Department of Agriculture

Ms. McCarrier
National Youth Alternatives

Hilary Millar
Bureau of Community Health Services, DHEW

Ann Milne
National Institute of Education

Oliver Moles
National Institute of Education

Audrey Moore
Adolescent Pregnancy Initiative

Lois Morrill
Social Research Group

David Muchnick
ACTION

Susan Nevas
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW

Theodora Ooms
Family Impact Seminar

Beryl Parke
Office of Education, DHEW

Julie Phillips
National Institute of Mental Health

Luisa Pollard
National Institute of Mental Health

William Prosser
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW

Sandra Robinson
Washington, D.C.

Milton Shore
Mental Health Study Center, National Institute of Mental Health

Moshe Smilansky
National Institute of Education

Susan Somerville
Social Research Group

Karl Stauber
Babcock Foundation

Maurice Sykes
Washington, D.C.

Joyce Taylor
Administration for Public Services, DHEW

Ellen Tenenbaum
National Institute of Education

Bill Trainer
National Youth Alternatives

Charles Wagner
Social Research Group

Jane Weinberg
Social Research Group

Bill Wolfe
The White House

Mary Ann Wolfe
Women's Bureau, DOL